



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,756	12/29/2000		Robert A. Marshall	062891.0451	5059
7590 11/15/2005				EXAMINER	
Baker Botts L.L.P. Suite 600				JAMAL, ALEXANDER	
2001 Ross Avei	nue			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Dallas, TX 75201-2980			2643		
				DATE MAILED: 11/15/200	DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/751,756	MARSHALL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Alexander Jamal	2643		

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. 🔲 The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a)⊠ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see response to arguments. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 13. Other: _____. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments submitted 10-27-2005 have been considered but are not 1. persuasive.

As per the combination of the Liu, Erreygers, and McGhee references (remarks page 11), examiner maintains the response given in the Final rejection sent 9-19-2005. Examiner contends that one skilled in the art would immediately recognize that providing increased system compatibility (such as the scaleable rate of Liu's transceivers and the splitters of McGhee's system) as a motivation to combine the teachings of all inventors.

As per applicant's argument regarding the Liu, Erreygers, and Fisher combination, examiner contends that one skilled in the art would recognize basic design tradeoffs such as space savings versus component choice when designing a device and would consider the space savings of a resistive bridge over inductors as a valid motivation to implement a resistive hybrid.

Examiner further notes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, examiner considers basic design tradeoffs such as space savings versus component choice, and increasing the

Application/Control Number: 09/751,756

Art Unit: 2643

compatibility of a device with a well known interface (the telephone line), as motivations

that any design engineer skilled in the telephony art would be aware of.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular

communications and 571-273-8300 for After Final communications.

AJ

November 9, 2005

CURTES KUNIZ

Page 3

Continuation of 3. NOTE: changed scope of all independent claims 16 and 18.